

REMARKS

Claims 3-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 2 have been cancelled herein. Claims 3-8 have been amended herein. New claims 9-16 have been added herein. The amendments to claims 3, 5, 6, and 8 relate to the claim number on which these claims depend. The amendments to claim 4 and 7 merely add limitations that were already present in these claims by virtue of their dependency on claim 2.

I. FORMAL MATTERS

Applicant notes with appreciation that the office action indicates that the drawings filed on October 15, 2003 are acceptable.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the office action acknowledges the claim to priority and indicates that the priority documents have been received.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the office action includes a copy of the PTO Form 1449 that was submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 26, 2003. The reference listed therein is initialed by the Examiner, thereby indicating that the reference

was considered and should be listed on the face of any patent that issues from the present application.

The office action does not include a copy of the PTO Form 1449 that was submitted in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on March 24, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide a copy of this Form 1449 with each reference initialed by the Examiner.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Claims 1, 6 and 8

Claims 1, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of "Structured Computer Organization (Tanenbaum). Claim 1 has been cancelled herein. Therefore, this rejection is now moot with respect to claim 1. Regarding claims 6 and 8, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 8 are patentable over the applied prior art for the reasons presented below.

B. Claims 2-5 and 7

Claims 2-5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Tanenbaum and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0043723 (Kodota)

Claim 2 has been cancelled herein. Therefore, with respect to claim 2, this rejection is now moot. With respect to claims 3, 4, 5 and 7, this rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits that neither AAPA, Tanenbaum nor Kodota teaches or suggests a DMA-transferring means for DMA-transferring liquid ejection data developed in the line buffer to the local memory per word unit, as recited by claim 4, on which claims 3 and 5 depend. This feature allows for a transfer rate that is approximately twice that of the conventional methods. In addition, the two side buffer areas make it possible to perform development processing of compressed recording data and transferring of in parallel. None of the relied on prior art teaches or suggests this feature.

Further, none of the relied on prior art references teaches or suggests a decode unit comprising a means for storing uncompressed liquid ejection data DMA-transferred from the main memory without being developed by said decode circuit based on hardware, as recited by

claim 7. This makes it possible to increase the liquid ejecting speed of the liquid ejecting apparatus with respect to the uncompressed liquid ejection data, which allows the high speed transfer of data, one of the objects of at least one embodiment of the present invention.

Further, Applicant submits that none of the prior art references teaches or suggests the combination of all of the features of the claimed invention.

Regarding new claims 9-16, Applicant submits that new claims 9-16 are patentable over the applied prior art for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 4, 5 and 7. Also, Applicant submits that the applied prior art does not teach or suggest the features recited in claims 9-16.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and allowance is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner believes that the prosecution of this case could be expedited through a telephone interview, he is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the phone number listed below.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are due for the subject application. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1105.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 28, 2005

Customer No.: 21874


John J. Penny, Jr.

(Reg. No.: 36,984)

EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Ma 02205

Tel: (617) 517-5549

Fax: (617) 439-4170